

COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS
DEPARTMENT OF TELECOMMUNICATIONS AND ENERGY

Petition of Boston Edison Company and
Commonwealth Electric Company, d/b/a NSTAR
Electric, for Approvals relating to the Renegotiation
of Purchase Power Agreements with
Northeast Energy Associates Limited Partnership

)
)
)
)
)
)
)

D.T.E. 04-85

ATTORNEY GENERAL'S MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION

I. INTRODUCTION

Pursuant to 220 C.M.R. §§ 1.11(9)&(10) and Department of Telecommunications and Energy (“Department”) precedent, the Attorney General seeks reconsideration of the Hearing Officer’s December 2, 2004 decision (“Order”). The Attorney General asks the Department to reconsider disallowing the Attorney General’s supplemental record request to Boston Edison Company and Commonwealth Electric Company, d/b/a NSTAR Electric, (the “Company”) for clarification of the Company’s response to RR-AG-3.

II. STANDARD OF REVIEW

A motion for reconsideration may be based on the argument that the Department's treatment of an issue was the result of mistake or inadvertence. *Massachusetts Electric Company*, D.P.U. 90-261-B, p. 7 (1991). The Department also may grant reconsideration of previously decided issues when extraordinary circumstances dictate that the Department take a fresh look at the record for the express purpose of substantively modifying a decision reached after review and deliberation. *North Attleboro Gas Company*, D.P.U. 94-130-B, p. 2 (1995); *Boston Edison Company*, D.P.U. 90-270-A, pp. 2-3 (1991). A motion for reconsideration should bring to light

previously unknown or undisclosed facts that would have a significant impact upon the decision already rendered. It should not attempt to reargue issues considered and decided in the main case. *Commonwealth Electric Company*, D.P.U. 92-3C-1A at 3-6 (1995).

III. ARGUMENT

The Department should grant this motion and allow the Company to respond to the Attorney General's November 29, 2004 supplemental request. In RR-AG-3, the Company's expert witness, Mr. Hevert, was asked to take the Henwood forecast numbers for the SEMA Rhode Island region and extract from that Mr. Hevert's calculation of what Henwood has included for LICAP. Tr. 1, p. 118. Mr. Hevert was then to add back to that LICAP calculations from the Company's November 4, 2004 testimony in docket FERC E03-563-030 (Exh. AG-1, p. 14), making assumptions to go beyond the forecast period in that testimony. *Id.* Mr. Hevert was to convert those numbers so that they would all be on a dollar-per-kilowatthour basis and recalculate its exhibit AG-1-38, which is Exhibit NSTAR-RBH-6 recalculated to include the latest Henwood 2004 Fall forecast. *Id.* Mr. Hevert was also asked to fully explain all of his assumptions. *See* Tr. 1, p. 114.

The Company's response to RR-AG-3 merely reiterated what Mr. Hevert stated on the record, that he was not aware of how Henwood quantified the capacity value in its market price forecasts. RR-AG-3; Tr. 1, p. 112-113. The purpose of the record request, in part, was to obtain a reasonable explanation of Henwood's quantification of capacity values, not a restatement of what Mr. Hevert did not know in the evidentiary hearing. *See* Tr. 1, pp. 112-118. Mr. Hevert does not explain his assumption that the Capacity Revenue Values on Table 5-4 of the Henwood

Fall 2004 Electricity and Fuel Price Outlook (see Exh. AG-1-36 (Supp), Att. AG-1-36

(a)(Supplemental)(Confidential Bulk)¹ reflect Henwood's projected capacity values. RR-AG-3.

Mr. Hevert also did not explain the reasoning for his several of his other assumptions: (1) why the Clearing Price by Zone values from Exh. AG-1 were assumed to be nominal dollars; (2) why it is appropriate to reflect a 95% availability factor for NEA in converting the per kW values in Exh. AG-1 to per kWh values and (3) why a system-wide capacity factor of 62 percent was assumed in converting Henwood's Capacity Factor Values to a dollar-per-kilowatthour basis. See RR-AG-3, Confidential Attachments (a) and (b).

On November 29, 2004, the Attorney General asked the Company questions about the assumptions Mr. Hevert made in the response to RR-AG-3 because those assumptions were not fully explained. The Company did not object to answering these questions. It does not go beyond what the Company was originally asked.

The LICAP prices by ISO-NE will add a significant cost to the Company's consumers. Exh. AG-1, p. i. The Commission is legally mandated to determine that each of the Company's proposed PPA buy out or restructuring not only mitigates transition costs; but also that the proposals result in just and reasonable rates. Without the opportunity to fully understand all components of the Company's economic analyses, the Department will not be able to determine the Company's rates are just and reasonable. Therefore, the Hearing Officer's December 2, 2004 ruling that the supplemental questions be disallowed should be reconsidered and the Company should respond to them.

¹ The Attorney General did not receive this supplemental, technical, bulk exhibit until November 18, 2004, the day of the evidentiary hearing.

IV. CONCLUSION

The Department should allow this motion and instruct the Company to respond to the Attorney General's supplemental questions.

Respectfully Submitted,

THOMAS F. REILLY
ATTORNEY GENERAL

By:

Colleen McConnell
Assistant Attorney General
Utilities Division
Public Protection Bureau
One Ashburton Place
Boston, MA 02108

December 7, 2004